

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 93 11:39:33 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #234
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 16 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 234

Today's Topics:

 Call sign snobbery (2 msgs)
 Chicago Scanner Ban, Changed legislation
 Code Debate- we are all telegraphists
 Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)
 FTP to ARRL (was Re: Dana's generalizations)
 Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right? (2 msgs)
 lotsadots
 machine-generated cw

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1993 01:46:55 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!e2big.mko.dec.com!peavax.mlo.dec.com!usenet@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I got rid of my WA1 call cause my hand got tired all the time calling CQ.
Of course, the Old Pharts hand got tired because they were doing something
else while calling CQ on phone. ;-)

Jeff
KD1IT / 7

(Former WN1YLY, WA1YLY, N1IPN)

Date: 16 Jul 93 18:35:03 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!cass.ma02.bull.com!petra!
popovich@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>The first number refers to the number of letters preceding the single number
>and the second number refers to the number of letters following the single
>number;

>
> 1x3 N2XYZ
> 1x2 N2AB
> 2x3 NN3DFI
>

>The 1xanything calls are becoming scarce in some areas...

And, of course:

2x1 WB3I
2x2 KB3DS

These just happen to be my favorite call signs in these two formats. :-)

The 1x2 calls have been impossible to get for quite some time. Now, I believe, the 2x1 calls are, as well. Or is there still somewhere where they haven't run out yet?

Someone mentioned a while back that the old W?# series of 2x3 calls are beginning to acquire sort of a small-time "old-timer" aura. It almost makes me wish I'd kept my old Novice (and General) call, WB3KJD. Almost. All those dahs were murder to send on CW. My Advanced call was better for CW, but it was a new-format call, and people kept coming up with the wrong kind of phonetics..."Dog S*t", for example. Oh well, I eventually ended up with another WB3 call, anyway. :-) It's a decent enough CW call, and doesn't seem to have quite such obvious embarrassing phonetics on phone.

-Steve, WB3I (ex-KB3DS, ex-WB3KJD)

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 93 13:05:22 GMT
From: walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Chicago Scanner Ban, Changed legislation
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

FYI to the amaetur radio newsgroups

Originally posted by:

In rec.radio.scanner article <CA7wFF.6BK@cbnewsc.cb.att.com>
rats@cbnewsc.cb.att.com (AOR AR-1000) writes:

The Chicago Sun-Times of July 14, 1993 (p. 14) had an article
entitled: "Too Much Static Kills Bid to Ban Scanners" by Fran Spielman.

Ald. Lawrence Bloom (5th) convinced the Police Committee to endorse
a substitute bill (the original bill was going to outlaw scanners
anywhere in Chicago) that will make it illegal to use a scanner to "aid
or abet the performance" of a criminal act after receiving "dozens"
of letters and phone calls from "amateur radio operators" who objected
to the original mobile scanner ban. Stupid, since it is already a
felony. However, it goes along with Bloom's comment about "I happen
to believe that printing [ordinances] is a very honorable profession."

(Comment from Bill Sohl, K2UNK) - Regardless of Alderman Bloom's
political rational, the important point here is that the original
legislation as proposed has been trashed and the new proposed
legislation will in no way affect amateurs or non-amateurs who
have radio equipment in their vehicle as long as they are not
committing a criminal act.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 1993 20:38:56 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!
wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Code Debate- we are all telegraphists

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <drew.8.0@trl.oz.au> drew@trl.oz.au (D.Diamond) writes:
>Look up "telegraphist" in your dictionary.

Ok.

telegraphist n. (British) a telegrapher

telegrapher n. a person who sends and receives messages by telegraph

telegraph n. an apparatus, system, or process for sending coded messages
over wires by means of electricity.

code n. a system of secret writing

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 15 Jul 93 14:42:32 EDT

From: pacbell.com!iggy.GW.Vitalink.COM!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!

psinntp!arrl.org@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Dana's generalizations (was Re: Lost petition for VHF/UHF beams)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, rcmolden@parmesan.cs.wisc.edu (Robertc. Moldenhauer) writes:

>Why don't the no coders just just the AARL and take it over? A critical mass
>of no coders would force the AARL to drop it's anti-no code bias.

Yaargh! (I feel ever so much better.)

It is ironic that I have seen postings in the last few weeks that accuse us of forcing no-code upon the FCC and ham community AND one accusing us of anti-no-code bias. :-)

Robert, in working here I really don't see an anti-no-code bias. Could you please elaborate a bit about what has caused your perception that we are opposed to the no-code license/operator? We have added the New Ham Companion section to QST, a section primarily directed toward the beginner.

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

Ed Hare, KA1CV
American Radio Relay League
225 Main St.

Newington, CT 06111
(203) 666-1541 - voice
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"The goal of every engineer is to
retire without getting blamed for a
major catastrophe." -- Scott Adams
and Dilbert

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 93 01:24:39 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!
csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: FTP to ARRL (was Re: Dana's generalizations)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <930715.011124.6U1.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs.com
(Tony Pelliccio) writes:

>ehare@arrl.org (Ed Hare - KA1CV) writes:

>

>> Thanks for your input, Tony. I will send you our list of HQ
>> email addresses (file: ARRL-EMAIL-ADR on info@arrl.org). That will
>> help you communicate a bit more directly.

>

>Hmmm.. that would be interesting. Is your available via FTP yet?

>

>Tony

Maybe SBS could operate an FTP server for ARRL items?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 15 Jul 1993 19:13:46 -0400
From: olivea!grapevine.lcs.mit.edu!ai-lab!bronze.lcs.mit.edu!not-for-
mail@ames.arpa
Subject: Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>rec.radio.amateur.policy #3493 (1 more) (1)--[1]
>From: kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan)
>[1] Re: Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?

Mike says:

>moisan@bronze.lcs.mit.edu (David Moisan) writes:

>> According to Michael, ham radio's not for young people without

>>the ability to pay for kilobuck equipment?

>That's not what I said.

>I stated that the people who complain about the average age of a ham
>operator have overlooked the obvious: that ham equipment is just too
>expensive for most kids to get involved.

>>Sure, there will always be exceptions to the rule. But, not every kid
>>will have some 80-year-old geezer down the street willing to give him
>>a tube set to use while he learns the code to upgrade.

So, you're pretending to be progressive. As long as amateur radio
continues the way it used to, you will be correct. I never had an elmer,
myself.

I think your insistence on this point says more about **your** mindset
than of any supposed young people. Points:

1) As Gary correctly points out, radios have gotten much cheaper in
relation to income. Had I had my ticket when I was working and in
college, I could've rearranged budgets and had my HT. Any kid
with a McJob could do the same, once convinced that an HT is more
important than those Reeboks.

2) GOOD clubs have club stations set up. I'm looking forward to using
my club's HF station when renovations to the building are complete.

3) GOOD elmers say "Hey, come up to **my** shack and spin the dials,
punch the keypads!" (Works in reverse sometimes. I elmered someone,
he got an HT, and **I** was the one to borrow it! :))

4) If all else fails, there **is** homebrew and mods. I have a module
ripped out of a 49 MHz cordless phone. I could be on the air on 6
meters if I ever get around to recrystalling it. Since you are SO
concerned about low-cost access, I suggest you join the r.r.a.homebrew
group where there's a thread going about a cheap 2M transmitter. I
couldn't care less about the zillions of CW-on-bailing-wire-and-tubes
articles.

But, that's not what you're about. This "new rig" red herring is just
an excuse to blow off the kids. Given your standards on this
newsgroup, that's a good thing.

>The push to get the no-code license passed was not to swell the ranks
>"to protect bandwidth" (most no-coders live on 2mtrs), but rather to
>increase the ranks so more V/UHF equipment could be sold, and higher
>advertising rates could be charged in QST.

Absurd. The major ham radio manufacturers do most of their business selling *commercial* gear, often at a higher profit margin than for their comparable (and sometimes equivalent) ham gear. Kenwood, Icom et. al. sure wouldn't miss us if the ham bands were reallocated. At least commercial buyers don't whine.

...Dave

--

David Moisan, N1KGH	/^_/_/^\	moisan@silver.lcs.mit.edu	
86 Essex St. Apt #204	(o ^ o)	n1kgh@amsat.org	
Salem. MA 01970-5225		ce393@cleveland.freenet.edu	

Date: 16 Jul 93 13:49:54 GMT
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Kids aren't supposed to know anything, right?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul15.090108.23848@anomaly.sbs.com> kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>moisan@bronze.lcs.mit.edu (David Moisan) writes:

>

>

>> According to Michael, ham radio's not for young people without
>>the ability to pay for kilobuck equipment?

>

>That's not what I said.

>

>I stated that the people who complain about the average age of a ham
>operator have overlooked the obvious: that ham equipment is just too
>expensive for most kids to get involved.

Same thing, different words. And we've said that's not true. Kids today spend far more on other recreational pursuits than the cost of a good used radio. Plus rolling your own is easier, and cheaper, today than ever before. We did it as kids in a time when wonderful transmitter on a chip and receiver on a chip circuits didn't exist. We did it when money was harder to come by, and amateur radios were more expensive, considering inflation. Amateur gear, like other consumer electronics, is cheaper today than ever before in terms of purchasing power. In the 1950s and 60s, top of the line gear cost nearly \$12,000 in 1990 dollarettes. That was a year's pay for the average worker. Today a much better performing rig is available for under a kilobuck new, or half that used. That's five lawns mowed

a week for two months.

>Sure, there will always be exceptions to the rule. But, not every kid
>will have some 80-year-old geezer down the street willing to give him
>a tube set to use while he learns the code to upgrade.

Maybe he doesn't see the need to learn code, or upgrade. HF isn't the end all and be all of amateur radio. But that aside, with 600,000 amateurs in the US, it's the rare kid indeed who doesn't live within biking distance of an amateur. Perhaps not a geezer, but that should be all the better. I've helped a half a dozen kids get on the air in the last year, I've got a rig out on loan right now. How many have you helped?

>The push to get the no-code license passed was not to swell the ranks
>"to protect bandwidth" (most no-coders live on 2mtrs), but rather to
>increase the ranks so more V/UHF equipment could be sold, and higher
>advertising rates could be charged in QST.

You don't understand the ARRL on this issue. They had to be dragged kicking and screaming into half-heartedly supporting no code licenses. It was the QCWA, TAPR, AMSAT, and a host of notable amateurs who pushed for full Tech privileges for the no code license. If the ARRL had had their way, it would have been a crippled thing like the Novice license sans HF CW.

Of course most of the newcomers gather on 2 meters, it's established ground. You shouldn't expect new operators to be trailbreakers at first. However, the increased population on 2 has been the incentive needed to get other more experienced hams to move on up and start populating other bands. Plus it's undoubted political and economic reality that numbers talk. The larger the number of amateurs, the more political impact they can have. The NRA has 3 million members and they are a major political force. If hams were nearly as dedicated and organized, they too could have a substantial impact on national and local laws and ordinances.

In the economic realm, the amateur market in the US is finally starting to grow again after 25 years of stagnation, and that has attracted more manufacturers offering more choices of equipment, and even one mass merchandiser back into the amateur market. That's good for all hams, except those who want to keep amateur radio a small clannish minority group dedicated to preserving the past. I want to see a vibrant, growing amateur radio in the US with at least 3 million members by 2000. The technical excitement of serving that big a body in our spectrum is heady indeed. New methods and new modes will be needed, the old ones won't be up to the job. I hope to live to see a revolution in amateur radio as big as the computer revolution we have been undergoing.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 1993 18:10:54 GMT

From: news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!calvin.tti.com!cole@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: lotsadots

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <225dj9INN9cv@emx.cc.utexas.edu> oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

>From: oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills)

>Subject: lotsadots

>Date: 16 Jul 1993 00:16:24 -0500

>n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu (Scott A Stambaugh N9LJX) asks:

>

>>In article <CA8ACv.D0G@fc.hp.com> perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:

>>>

>>>A few weeks ago, I heard god on 40m CW: N5EE. It went by so fast, I

>>>was still waiting to copy. Almost makes me want to move to Texas - NOT!

>>>

>>>Perry AA0ET

>

>>Anybody remember the call that has been popping up lately..EI5SH or something
>>to that effect?

>

> In Oct 92 I worked EI5HE, could this be it? I managed to end the

> QSO by sending best wISHES HI EI5HE aa5bt, giving 32 dots in a row -

> it was to good to miss. OK, 33 if you count the first bit of A.

>

> K5EE is on our PacketCluster sometimes, and I have met AE5E. It's

> good to know that the owners of these calls use them on cw, it would

> be an awful waste not to. Nice hearing WB9EEE in the pile-ups too.

>

> Somehow it feels wrong working JA7SSB in cw contests (although 'ssb' has

> a nice cw rhythm). And the only TT I have ever worked is TT8CW - who w

> as on ssb - curses...

>

>

>Derek Wills (AA5BT, G3NMX)

>Department of Astronomy, University of Texas,

>Austin TX 78712. (512-471-1392)

>oo7@astro.as.utexas.edu

This all reminds me of the phonetics used by Warren Davis, W6EE:

W 6 Electric Enema

: -)

Randy Cole
KN6W

Date: Thu, 15 Jul 93 18:49:43 GMT
From: tribune.usask.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!alberta!adec23!mark@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: machine-generated cw
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

alanb@sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>I sure can. Besides the obvious sending errors, hand-sent code just

You can almost be guaranteed that hand sent code will have either a query, double i, or 6-10 dots in a row just before something gets repeated correctly ...

Of, cursre I dnot maek typign mstakse, btu how do I sned out a correctin on hte confuser since it dsnt hve an 8 dot code?

>Machine code may sound nice and clean, but it does get
>monotonous after awhile.

Of the very few QSOs I have had that were sent to me machine generated, I actually enjoyed the code more since we managed to yack. Besides, he got a chuckle when I congratulated him on how much his code had improved ...

He cranked his speed, at this point, and I still copied him solid at his highest typing speed. It is a joy to listen to code sent with a good (if not perfect) fist :-).

-- Mark

Date: Fri, 16 Jul 93 03:40:25 GMT
From: mentor.cc.purdue.edu!noose.ecn.purdue.edu!en.ecn.purdue.edu!n9ljx@purdue.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <222a6uINNnv8@topaz.bds.com> ,

<1993Jul15.172451.28970@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>, <CA8ACv.D0G@fc.hp.com>.edu
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <CA8ACv.D0G@fc.hp.com> perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) writes:
>
>A few weeks ago, I heard god on 40m CW: N5EE. It went by so fast, I
>was still waiting to copy. Almost makes me want to move to Texas - NOT!
>
>Perry
>AA0ET

Anybody remember the call that has been popping up lately..EI5SH or something
to that effect?

--
Scott Stambaugh - N9LJX internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu
Operations Supervisor, ADPC phone: 317 494 7946
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907-1061

Date: 16 Jul 1993 07:17:05 -0400
From: noc.near.net!genrad.com!genrad.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CA7Fps.BKF@feenix.metronet.com>,
<1993Jul15.141959.705@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<1993Jul15.140339.1@vms4.sc.csupomona.edu>
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <1993Jul15.140339.1@vms4.sc.csupomona.edu>
armyrman@vms4.sc.csupomona.edu (Alex Myrman) writes:
>>>But seriously folks, wouldn't you like to see them re-issue old calls?
>
>> You bet!!
>here here!!
>I too would also like to see old calls recycled. Maybe family members get
>top priority then extra, advanced,,,etc. It would be nice to atleast have a
>chance to get some old 1x2's or something or whatever is floating around.

The latest "W5YI Report" has an article in it which looks like the FAA is
considering "selling" old callsigns.....it may not be as far in the future
as you think....

Diana

--
->Diana L. (Syriac) Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea) <-
->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST CAP: CPT, Freedom 690 Mobile<-
->AD ASTRA, PER ASPERA Airplane: None :-(
<-
->GenRad, MS/6, 300 Baker Ave, Concord, Mass. 01742 (508)369-4400 x2459 <-

Date: 16 Jul 93 14:20:46 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul15.141959.705@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>,
<1993Jul15.140339.1@vms4.sc.csupomona.edu>, <2262nhINNjsu@sweetpea.genrad.com>
Subject : Re: Call sign snobbery

In article <2262nhINNjsu@sweetpea.genrad.com>, dls@genrad.com (Diana L. Carlson) writes:

|> In article <1993Jul15.140339.1@vms4.sc.csupomona.edu>
armyman@vms4.sc.csupomona.edu (Alex Myrman) writes:
|> >>>But seriously folks, wouldn't you like to see them re-issue old calls?
|> >
|> >> You bet!!
|> >here here!!
|> >I too would also like to see old calls recycled. Maybe family members get
|> >top priority then extra, advanced,,,etc. It would be nice to atleast have a
|> >chance to get some old 1x2's or something or whatever is floating around.
|>
|> The latest "W5YI Report" has an article in it which looks like the FAA is
|> considering "selling" old callsigns.....it may not be as far in the future
|> as you think....
|>
|> Diana

|> --
|> ->Diana L. (Syriac) Carlson dls@genrad.com Ham: KC1SP (Sweet Pea) <-
|> ->I'D RATHER BE FLYING! P-ASEL, INST CAP: CPT, Freedom 690 Mobile<-
|> ->AD ASTRA, PER ASPERA Airplane: None :-(
|> <-
|> ->GenRad, MS/6, 300 Baker Ave, Concord, Mass. 01742 (508)369-4400 x2459 <-

--
FAA - geez, now everyone wants in on handing out callsigns... ;-)

+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0X?? (in the mail) +
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +

+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+

+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P

+

+++++

Date: 16 Jul 93 13:13:13 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CA59vu.GJp@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1993Jul14.130047.3228@ke4zv.uucp>, <1993Jul14.190733.10398@Csl.Stanford

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: Brilliant postings

In article <1993Jul14.190733.10398@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>In <1993Jul14.130047.3228@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.uucp (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>If you poke your nose into HRO as often as I do, you notice that there

>>is a rapid turnover of VHF/UHF equipment, particularly HTs, but that

>>the sales of HF gear is much less. That despite the higher margins

>>involved in them. And the poor sad code keys seem to have a heavy

>>layer of dust in their cabinet. More striking perhaps is the used

>>shelf at The Ham Station. They can't keep good VHF/UHF gear on the

>>shelf, but they have HF equipment that's languished there for over

>>a year. Ask a used car dealer what it means when something sound

>>sits on the lot that long.

>

>There are several factors in favor of a larger turnover in VHF/UHF equipment.

>The first is the much larger user population, by a factor of at least three.

Yeah, that's what I've been saying. My club survey showed that ratio.

>I'm sorry Gary, but your statements about the light use of CW on HF simply
>are not bourne out in my experience. On 20, the number of CW QSOs is about
>the same as for SSB every time I've checked, and the number of CW QSOs on
>40 generally exceeds the SSB QSOs.

Well my band survey didn't find that ratio, in particular packet and RTTY/AMTOR made up a considerable portion of the non-voice stations heard, but I'm not claiming that CW is not used on HF, only that it's a minority modulation method among hams, and I mean coded licensees, don't even count the no code techs. Remember that current HF usage is determined by a self-selected subpopulation of amateurs who have, by law, had to pass a code exam.

>I also don't agree with your speculations about CW usage dying off. The club
>in which I participate (Stanford ARC, W6YX) has 42 members, 35 of whom are
>General or above. Of those, 19 are primarily CW ops, with the rest putting
>in a few hours now and then during contests. And, oh yeah, the average
>member age is under 30. Go figure.

I suspect that contesters are more likely to use CW than the average amateur because there are special mode multipliers in some of the contests. And of course QRP operators are primarily CW operators. I am not anti-code operating, it has it's place like other modes. I even use it myself on occasion, though I have to write down the dots and dashes and sight read them. I can do that up to about 15 WPM so it's not too bad for making a contact to test some new bit of RF hardware. I am against it's undue influence in amateur examinations as ~~the~~ defining thing about a ham operator's skills or character. As to the decline of Morse, I do believe that it's used by a smaller percentage of amateurs than ever before, and that that decline is accelerating. According to QST, even among Novices, people who bothered to take a code exam when it's no longer an absolute requirement, only 5,000 of 55,000 surveyed actually operate CW. That says more to me than all the no code licenses issued. They bothered to learn Morse, and they still don't use it.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #234
